DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 040 80 EM 007 940

TITLE	Evaluation Practices Used in the Selection of Educational Materials and Equipment.
INSTITUTION	Educational Products Information Exchange Inst., New York, N.Y.; New York State Education Dept., Albany. Div. of Educational Communications.; New York State Univ. System, Albany.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
PUB DATE	Dec 69
NOTE	117p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.95
DESCRIPTORS	Equipment Evaluation, *Evaluation Criteria, *Instructional Materials, *Selection, State Departments of Education, Textbook Selection

ABSTRACT

To determine how the state department of education may increase its usefulness to local agencies in the process of evaluating and selecting educational products, representatives in each state of the Association of Chief State School Audio-Visual Officers and the coordinator for each state of activities under Title III of the National Defense Education Act were contacted. More than 150 reports or statements were received, evaluated, and coded as to the nature of materials being evaluated, of persons making judgments, and of procedures used. The coded materials were used to prepare examples of differing selection practices encountered during the survey, and were used to provide a description of present practices in evaluation for selection and use--how school decision makers decide which materials to use for instruction. Information received in the course of the survey is reported under three major categories: selection of textbooks, including any supplementary materials offered as part of the textbook program; selection of other supplementary materials--additional books, films, kits, exhibits, etc.; and selection of equipment. A state of the art paper is included. (Author/SP)

EVALUATION PRACTICES USED IN THE SELECTION OF EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

ED038040

December 1969

EM007940

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK/THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
DIVISION OF EDUCATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS
ALBANY, NEW YORK • 12224

ED038040

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR
ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF
VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECES-
SARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY

Evaluation Practices Used in The Selection of Educational Materials and Equipment

December 1969

A report prepared by the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute under subcontract to the New York State Education Department, as part of the fulfillment of a contract between the New York State Education Department and the United States Office of Education, under Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The University of the State of New York
The State Education Department
Division of Educational Communications
Albany, New York

FOREWORD

The committee appointed to advise on this project came to the unanimous conclusion that time is more than ripe to improve product selection procedures in American education. A massive expansion in the use of the technology which society puts at the school's disposal is inevitable if we are to keep our schools efficient. It is urgent that the large sums of money required to implement technological developments be carefully and wisely administered, and that insofar as possible teachers and students find themselves equipped for the experience of learning. The committee members were able to add to one another's cautionary tales concerning instructional equipment for which no materials are available, or which have been offered to educators before being sufficiently tried out by their developers. The committee members also exchanged caveats concerning materials which require highly trained operating personnel, or which add significant amounts to schools' operating and maintenance budgets. They were also aware of books and learning systems and kits which operate effectively only when the teacher can deal with one or at most three students at a time. In addition they were concerned about those materials which depend for full usefulness upon access to sources not readily available, or materials which are attractively packaged or illustrated but which turn out to have little substance.

The selection practices which might lead to serious errors of purchase from the expanded materials market are unconsciously revealed in reported comments from persons familiar with how materials are chosen. It seems, for instance, that selectors sometimes fail to investigate claims made for products. Sometimes they select from among the first few items offered, either because they are unaware of more appropriate options or because there is no time to look further. Or purchasers may select in too small a context, without sufficient information about the other materials students will be using and with no idea of the possibilities for interaction among various materials. They may buy in blind faith that a device, because it is offered to schools, can be operated safely by teachers and students. Sometimes the purchaser is seduced by the ingenuity or popularity of a new device without proper regard to the needs for special training for teachers using it or for additional personnel to operate and maintain it.

The reports received in the survey were not reassuring that such selection "accidents" cannot continue to happen. Particularly it was clear that even if local selectors were always aware of all the types of information they need before making a choice, it would be beyond the resources of most local districts to develop such information. A need for central sources of information made itself felt. Accordingly the committee, at its last meeting, agreed to the following propositions:

> In the matter of the selection of educational materials, every state education authority has a responsibility it cannot abdicate to see that essential information reaches local schools.

The information should be gathered from, and shared among, various kinds of agencies such as local school systems, regional or state education authorities, and independent agencies, to avoid duplication of effort.

The committee recognizes the necessity for documenting these findings in a report and for setting a framework for further action, including devising a means or specifying an agency to coordinate such action.

This report is the first step towards the goal of stimulating improvement in selection practices. Other incentives and assistances will be forthcoming. Suggestions and offers of cooperation will be appreciated.

The Advisory Committee:

Edward G. Bernard (New York City)
James A. Boula (Illinois)
Lee E. Campion (New York State)
Nile D. Coon (Pennsylvania)
Robert Gerletti (Los Angeles County)
Claude Hass (California)
Guy Helmke (California)
William C. Lewis (Delaware)
George Lipscomb (Texas)
Francis Pinkowski (New Jersey)
David J. Rees (New York State)
J. M. Shaver (North Carolina)

PREFACE

This is a report of existing evaluation practices employed in the selection of educational materials and equipment for use in elementary and secondary schools. The U. S. Office of Education funded the major portion of the study as provided in Title V, Section 505, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, under a contract with the New York State Education Department, which also supplied matching funds. Representatives of state education authorities in California, Delaware, Illinois, New Jersey, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Texas served as advisors, and the Educational Products Information Exchange (EPIE) Institute carried out the work of the survey under a subcontract. The ultimate aim of the study, in accordance with the provisions of Title V ESEA, is to determine how the state department of education may increase its usefulness to local agencies in the process of evaluating and selecting educational products.

Although the sponsors of this study were primarily interested in learning about the varying roles played by state departments in materials and equipment selection, the Advisory Committee (representatives of the eight cooperating state education authorities and of two large school systems) directed the EPIE Institute to report on any identifiable evaluation practices for the selection of instructional material and equipment, whether or not related to the activities of state departments of education. Given this charge and the necessarily short duration (six months) of the study, the following information-gathering procedures were adopted:

1. The Director of the Division of Educational Communications, New York State Education Department, wrote to the representative in each state of the Association of Chief State School Audio-Visual Officers, and to the coordinator for each state of activities under Title III of the National Defense Education Act, explaining the project and requesting a "telephone appointment."

2. On the basis of replies, persons in each state were telephoned by members of the EPIE staff or by an Associate in Educational Communications, New York State Education Department. Copies of relevant reports, forms, and procedures were requested, and assistance was requested in finding others who might be able to help in the project.

3. On the basis of replies, the Director of Educational Communications, New York State Education Department, wrote to approximately seventy-five more persons, and the EPIE staff made some fifty additional telephone calls.

4. On the basis of information received during consultations with university curriculum researchers, with school officials, and with organizations concerned with educational materials purchasers, the EPIE Institute staff wrote to about twenty additional persons.

5. More than one hundred fifty reports or statements were received. Some twenty-five were not germane to this particular project. The others were read by the EPIE staff

and coded as to nature of materials being evaluated, of persons making judgments, or procedures used, and other pertinent facts. In addition, approximately fifteen reports already in the possession of the EPIE Institute were read and coded.

6. The coded materials were used to prepare examples of differing selection practices encountered during the survey.

These information-gathering and summarizing activities resulted in a full (though not exhaustive) report. The scope of the report is the description of present practices in evaluation for selection and use--how school decision-makers decide which materials to use for instruction. Except that satisfaction (or lack of it) with previously used materials form part of the selection process, the results of other types of evaluation (programmatic, training, developmental) are not considered in this report.

The information received in the course of the survey divides itself into three major categories: selection of textbooks, including any supplementary materials offered as part of the textbook program; selection of other supplementary materials--additional books, films, kits, exhibits and such items; and selection of equipment, which can range from buying an overhead projector to introducing instructional television into the classroom. The evidence is that the increased use of nonprint materials has led to the development of processes and techniques for evaluating them--and their mediating devices--but they are still, for the most part, separated from and less elaborate and formal than textbook selection processes.

The survey results are presented as an array of concrete examples of actual practices now being used across the country by state departments, local school systems, ESEA Title III and Special Education Materials Centers, regional media projects, the military, and religious educational systems. The information is presented in this concrete fashion with the hope that such a description of the present "state of the art" of material and equipment selection will cause all concerned with this important educational activity to reflect upon and act to improve upon both the efficiency and the effectiveness of existing evaluation and selection practices. State education departments in particular should find much in this document to cause them to rededicate themselves to fostering improvements in these practices at both the state and the local level. The persons responsible for the programs described in many cases welcome further questions, which the EPIE Institute (386 Park Avenue South, New York, New York 10016) will be glad to transmit.

The sponsoring agencies wish to acknowledge the excellent cooperation of those persons in state education departments throughout the country who cooperated with the project staff in supplying information either through correspondence or via telephone interviews. They are to be thanked particularly for their help in identifying nonstate-agency evaluation activities in their own and other states. The sponsors also wish to recognize the work of David Rees of the Division of Educational Communications, New York State Education Department, who served as

liaison between his department and the EPIE Institute and as coordinator for Advisory Committee meetings. In particular they wish to acknowledge the contribution made at every phase of the study by Betty Braxton Preston, Director of Special Projects at the EPIE Institute, who took the major responsibility not only for collecting the survey information but also for producing from it a cohesive and serviceable report.

Lee E. Campion
New York State Education Department
P. Kenneth Komoski
The EPIE Institute

CONTENTS

The State of the Art.. 1

Textbook Selection.. 7
- Index No. 018: An Adoption State Enlists the Aid of the State Education Authority in Final Review................ 10
- Index No. 101: A City in an Adoption State (018) Selects Books from the State List.............................. 12
- Index No. 097: A Nonadoption State Surveys the Treatment of Minorities in State-Used Textbooks.................... 14
- Index No. 013: A City in a Nonadoption State Considers Treatment of Minorities in Selecting Textbooks........... 16
- Index No. 084: The State Board of Education Directs Adoption of Elementary-Level Textbooks................... 18
- Index No. 009: A City Located in a State which Adopts Elementary Textbooks (084) Adopts Secondary Texts......... 20
- Index No. 005: A Nonadoption State Develops a Comprehensive Curriculum Aid.. 22
- Index No. 010: A State Adopts Books at the Elementary Level.. 25
- Index No. 028: Textbook Selection in a Large City in a State (010) which Adopts Elementary Texts............... 27
- Index No. 019: An Adoption State Channels Evaluations from Schools to a Small Selection Committee.............. 31
- Index No. 055: A County School Division in an Adoption State (019) Selects Books for Local Use................. 33
- Index No. 041: A Regulatory Nonadoption State............. 34
- Index No. 096: A School District in a Regulatory Nonadoption State (041) Selects Textbooks................ 36
- Index No. 001: An Adoption State Calls Upon Two Professional Committees................................ 38
- Index No. 135: A School System in a Nonadoption State Substitutes a Variety of Media for the Single Textbook.... 42

Selection of Supplementary Materials........................ 45
- Index No. 020: A County School System "Polices" its Media Collection.. 48
- Index No. 015: Film Selection for State Film Libraries..... 50
- Index No. 030: A Media Center Catalogs User Opinions of Software... 51
- Index No. 042: A County-Wide Filmstrip Review............. 52
- Index No. 054: Curriculum-Oriented Selection for a City's Audiovisual Libraries.............................. 53
- Index No. 045: Cooperative Selection for ETV.............. 54
- Index No. 089: Evaluation of Nonprint Media to Implement a New Approach to the Curriculum....................... 55

Index No. 131: Introduction of a New Medium................ 56
Index No. 092: A City School System Adds to Its Libraries.. 57
Index No. 039: Nonprint Materials for a Specific Topic..... 59
Index No. 091: A State "Adopts" Library Books and Audiovisual Materials for Local Schools.................. 60
Index No. 022: Media Selection on a Coordinated Curriculum Basis.. 62
Index No. 003: A State Supplies Schools with Film Reviews.. 63

Equipment Selection.. 64
Index No. 086: A Statewide Committee Looks at Equipment.... 68
Index No. 056: A Field Check Manual........................ 69
Index No. 037: Selection in a University.................. 71
Index No. 052: Selection in a City System................. 72
Index No. 128: A Dual-Purpose Workshop.................... 73
Index No. 011: Laboratory Tests of Videotape Recorders..... 74
Index No. 094: An Evaluation to Assist Purchasers.......... 75
Index No. 004: A Survey of Equipment in Use................ 77

Special-Purpose Selection.. 79
Special Education Materials.................................. 79
Index No. 040: Selection for the Mentally Retarded......... 80
Index Nos. 057 and 058: Selection for Migrant Children..... 81
Index No. 093: Selection for the Handicapped............... 82
Index No. 140: A Special Education Instructional Materials Center Specializes in Cooperating with Producers.......... 83
Index No. 129: Selection for the Deaf...................... 84

Programed Instruction Materials.............................. 85
Index No. 095: Selection of Programed Instruction Materials 86

Standardized Tests... 87

Special Curriculum Materials................................. 88
Index No. 104: Selection for Individualized Instruction.... 89
Index No. 105: A Social Studies Project.................... 90
Index No. 106: Available Materials in Individualized Instruction.. 91

Bibliography... 92

Appendix A: Members of the Advisory Committee.................. 93

Appendix B: A Note on Evaluation Forms........................ 94

Appendix C: Forms Used in the Survey........................... 100

THE STATE OF THE ART

It is not easy for the educator to grasp even in his imagination the vast variety of instructional materials available today. To take textbooks alone, a state department of public instruction noted in 1967 that there were forty-four hundred different textbook titles offered for sale in the state, six hundred and sixty of them in the area of social studies.[1] When one adds the materials, devices, systems, and equipment available to supplement or supplant the textbook, it is a matter of wonder and, all too often, bewilderment to the educational decision maker. Materials are available to engage the student's eye or ear, or both, for manipulation, for experimentation, for interaction and reinforcement--not only because electronic and other such advances have made these developments possible, but also primarily because the student's newly complex world makes it imperative to offer him more than text and teacher.

In the face of this flood of materials, and of newly available funds to purchase them, educational decision makers have begun to develop techniques which will permit competent and satisfactory selections while avoiding waste and duplication of effort in the selection process, with what would appear to be, so far, limited success. There are egregious examples of careful and thoughtful approaches to the question of selecting materials, but they are, unfortunately, far from widespread. Certainly they were late in developing.

---

[1] Michigan Department of Education. A Report on the Treatment of Minorities in American History Textbooks, Lansing: Michigan Department of Education, 1968, Appendix A, no pagination.

In all too few cases, school districts have banded together to share the costs and tasks of investigating the huge collection of educational products before deciding which to buy. Results are, for the most part, disseminated only within the area which undertook the cooperative effort, though frequently their usefulness could be much more extensive than that.

There is some recourse, in the new attempt to systematize the selection of materials, to check lists and guidelines--an appendix to this report is devoted to a review of such instruments and their place in the selection process. As will be seen, they may facilitate that process but they assuredly are not the cure for all selection ills, and when they lend an illusion of scientific precision they are the very opposite of useful.

Also added to the usual examination or testing of materials or equipment are such practices as trial use of products in a classroom setting, formal meetings with producers of materials, and consultation with curriculum or subject-matter specialists. Particularly in decisions as to whether to add a book or a film to a library, educators make use of published reviews and annotated catalogs, not only for preliminary screening but in the final decision. And published analyses by subject-matter experts of curriculum materials are just beginning to play a part in selection.

An increasingly common selection practice, particularly for supplementary materials, is use of central collections of materials--an instructional-materials center, an educational-resources center, an educational-media selection center, or similarly named facility--where one may examine materials and discuss them with a curriculum specialist. Educators fortunate enough to have access to such a center are spared considerable paperwork, save a great deal of time, and more than likely solve a space and storage problem.

It is proper to mention here the basic work of the EPIE Institute, the nationwide educational information exchange which prepared this report. Comprehensive descriptions and evaluative reports on materials available for a given purpose, with information presented in comparable terms and, where possible, in tabular form to permit across-the-board comparisons and evaluations, are available from the Institute. Information reported includes critical analysis of content of material and evaluations based on user experience. Expansion is continuing of areas and materials covered, varieties of professional analysis provided, and base for collecting, classifying, and reporting user experiences. Consultative and training services are available as well as reports.

To reiterate by way of summary--the users of these various plans, procedures, and aids are still far too few; many more need to be brought to the realization that selection plays a vital part in using educational materials effectively. And the few who are attempting systematization are far from smug about the completeness and efficiency of their procedures as so far developed. They report numerous lacks and dissatisfactions.

The lack of consistency in educators' judgments is a difficulty; requesting responses to specific questions helps in this connection, and there is evidence that training in selection practices would help even more. Perhaps training, too, could assist in the problem of special point of view--educators ignore technical aspects sometimes; engineers forget educational considerations sometimes. The fact that persons selected to evaluate materials are not, in some cases, representative of the entire community for which they are selecting is another problem. One large city has established a procedure for examination--after preliminary selection but before final selection--of all textbooks in light of criteria concerning the presentation of information about minority groups.

Still another problem is that of significant differences among teachers in their approach to and use of materials, facts not easily known to or usable by those who must recommend materials. This problem is compounded by the lack so far of systematic information about users' experiences with materials. "Popularity" ratings are sometimes available, but they are related only to frequency of use, not to conditions of use or effectiveness of results.

Since teachers very often write or edit textbooks, selection of persons to review them sometimes presents problems. State statutes often make it explicit that no one shall evaluate textbooks during a period when he has any sort of business relationships with a publisher who is submitting textbooks for evaluation. Similar prohibitions occur in some city regulations as well.

A special aspect of the always troublesome time factor deserves some attention. Extensive evaluation projects, particularly those to select textbooks, often consider materials on a rotating schedule--social studies one year, mathematics the next, for instance--since manpower and purchase money are far from unlimited. This can mean as much as a six-year gap in the consideration of a given type of materials unless special arrangements are made. Similar problems in projects to add supplementary education materials to collections are the administrative ones of scheduling evaluators and collating their evaluations.

In the matter of materials, there can be other problems than the one of oversupply. A contradictory one is the sometimes-noted absence of any material to fill a stated need--an indication perhaps of the desirability of closer cooperation between users and developers of materials. Inadequate or inaccurate descriptions of materials submitted for review can lead to waste of time; some programs include detailed specifications to producers, in part to combat just that sort of waste, at the risk, perhaps, of missing some new or innovative approaches to educational problems.

Certain aspects of the problems of selection which came clear in the course of the survey, but which were not specifically mentioned by respondents, include the effect of legalities and red tape on the process. Not only are state laws sometimes specific about material which must be covered in--or omitted from--textbooks in use in the state, but, as implied earlier, they may make it impossible, or at least very difficult, to change to a new, superior textbook until a stated period of adoption is over. Similarly, purchase regulations may necessitate purchase at less than the optimum time, with insufficient information on hand for wise selection. In cases, for instance, where budgetary requirements make it necessary to use up purchase funds before a deadline, money is sometimes spent, without much investigation, for materials which turn out to be useless.

Perhaps the most distressing reports of all are those of no systematic evaluation programs at all because of lack of funds to support them. The suspicion approaches a conviction that such saving is false economy.

Each of the major types of educational product--textbooks, supplementary materials, and equipment--presents a different selection pattern. The rest of this report is devoted to detailed descriptions, without comment by reporter or compiler, of programs which illustrate those patterns. It is hoped that they will give the reader a comprehensive picture of the state of the art (it is hardly yet a science) of materials selection.

TEXTBOOK SELECTION

Typical procedures for textbook selection indicate recognition of the continued centrality and therefore importance of textbooks in the instructional picture--considerable time, effort, and money go into their selection. Much emphasis is put on the opinion of the experienced teacher; even in the very few cases where a state authority specifies one particular book for use throughout the state in a given class and subject, at least a few classroom teachers have had some say in selection.

In twenty-four states, textbooks are evaluated on a state level and a selection of books is adopted for use throughout the state; in the other states, a local authority is responsible for evaluation and selection of textbooks. (In a few cases, the state adopts books for elementary use and local units select books for secondary use.) That distinction is an important one, but the variations within each of the two styles of selection are so great that practices in differently labeled states may not vary as much as the distinction implies. At least one adoption state lists almost every textbook available for any given subject, another allows local school units to choose whether they will participate in the state textbook program, and several others permit choice of books outside the adopted list, with more-or-less easily obtained state approval. One state permits local districts to withdraw from the state-supported school system, and another permits schools to add to the state textbook list.

On the other hand, several nonadoption states have detailed statutory regulations governing local selection procedures, as well as prescribed courses of study. Others require that local systems list their selections with a state authority for his approval (and at least one of those states specifies the criteria against which local authorities must compare books). Some states, too, specify how frequently and in what sequence local school authorities must select texts.

In reviewing the procedures in use for selecting textbooks, it is possible to isolate steps taken, in various combinations and sequences, by selection committees.[2] It may be useful to list those steps here, with the comment that no one procedure encountered encompasses all the steps, but that no example came forth which did not include examination and review of textbooks under consideration.

1. Curriculum planning
2. Development of criteria
3. Examination and review of textbooks
4. Meetings with textbook publishers' representatives
5. Trial use of textbooks in classroom situations
6. Consultation with curriculum and subject-matter specialists
7. Submission of textbook choices to the public

The examples of textbook-selection procedures described in the following pages show how several state and local authorities, working in the framework of legal requirements and restraints, curriculum considerations, and budget and time limitations, combine and arrange these processes in order to evaluate textbooks. It will be noted that in several instances a description of local practices follows immediately, and refers specifically to, the description of procedures in the home state.

---

[2] A hearsay report, received just before this report went to press, indicates that two school systems in the same nonadoption state add to this list of steps the solicitation of opinion of texts from students.

Index No. 018: An Adoption State Enlists the Aid of the State Education Authority in Final Review

After the special textbook committee makes its selections, the staff of the state education authority reviews the selections from a special point of view.

I. The State Board of Education decides in which areas textbooks will be adopted in a given year. Most books are adopted for a six-year period; they may be readopted. Also, textbooks may be adopted for new courses in which at least ten thousand students are enrolled throughout the state. Publishers are requested to notify the Board of books which they offer for adoption.

II. The State Board of Education appoints a Textbook Committee composed of fifteen teachers and administrators. Committee members during their tenure are state officials and take the oaths required of all state officials.

III. The list of textbooks to be considered is published in newspapers throughout the state, and members of the Textbook Committee hear citizens regarding any objections to books listed.

IV. Each Textbook Committee member meets with a representative of each publisher, with his chosen advisers (lay or professional specialists in a subject-matter field) present if he so desires.

V. The Textbook Committee reviews books, with the help of its appointed advisers, and recommends to the State

Commissioner of Education five books for each subject, or fewer if five suitable books are not available, but never fewer than two.

VI. Members of the state education authority staff review all recommended books for the Commissioner of Education, to see if they are suitable, present factual information, and adhere to American ideals.

VII. The Commissioner may not add titles, but may remove them, so long as two per subject remain. Publishers or other citizens may request hearings if dissatisfied with the Commissioner's decisions.

VIII. The list of recommended books is presented to the State Board of Education, which holds a meeting to hear any appeals from the recommendations of the Commissioner, to adopt textbooks, and to approve contracts for their purchase.

Index No. 101: A City in an Adoption State (018) Selects Books from the State List

Every teacher's opinion is sought as the city decides among the offerings on the state list.

I.

- A. A Textbook Adoption Committee is appointed, consisting, for secondary book selection, of one teacher from each school for each subject being considered, and for elementary schools, one teacher and the principal from twenty representative elementary schools. The Adoption Committee operates in subcommittees, according to subject and grade.
- B. Each subcommittee develops criteria for evaluating books and prepares evaluation check lists.
- C. The subcommittees meet with representatives of textbook publishers to hear presentations concerning their books.
- D. Each school representative has every teacher in his school who teaches a subject or grade under consideration evaluate and complete check lists for the books on the state list. The school representative summarizes the evaluations and indicates first, second, and third choices of the teachers in his school.

E. Each subcommittee then meets to make a final decision and to recommend a book for adoption to the Board of School Trustees.

II. The Board of School Trustees, on the basis of the recommendations, adopts textbooks for use in schools throughout the city for the period specified by the state education authority.

Index No. 097: A Nonadoption State Surveys the Treatment of Minorities in State-Used Textbooks

A state department of education conducts a study which produces guidelines to assist in the selecting of textbooks which, as required by state law, fairly recognize the achievements and contributions of all racial and ethnic groups.

I. In response to a legislative act requiring the State Superintendent of Schools to survey the social-studies texts in use in the state to determine whether they include recognition of the achievements of racial and ethnic groups, a small professional committee was formed in 1967 to report to the State Superintendent. The committee narrowed its task to consider only American history texts, as being used by large numbers of students and as closely related to the intent of the legislation under which they had been appointed.

II. A survey of a twenty-five percent representative sample of school districts in the state, supplemented by information from publishers about textbook adoptions, resulted in a list of nine secondary and three elementary American history texts in common use throughout the state.

III. A committee of professional historians was asked to nominate six other professional historians to serve on an American History Review Panel. Each member of the panel was asked to review in detail two of the twelve commonly used books; reviewers and books were paired at random.

The reviewers' criticisms confirmed apparent doubts about the adequacy of the textbooks from the standpoint of their treatment of minorities, especially Negroes. Indeed, their overall judgment of the books in use amounted to condemnation, though there were favorable comments about each book and they were not all judged to be equally inadequate. The reviews supplied some of the basis for the development of detailed guidelines for use in evaluating textbooks on the dimension of treatment of minorities. The guidelines cover four major considerations: historical accuracy, realistic treatment of the history of minorities, the concept of race, and the total effect of the textbook's treatment of minorities.

IV. The committee recommends to local school authorities selection of textbooks in terms of the criteria, supplementing presently used inadequate books with instructional materials that more nearly meet the criteria, and preparing staffs for use of the criteria in judging all instructional materials.

Index No. 013: A City in a Nonadoption State Considers Treatment of Minorities in Selecting Textbooks

Two years before the passage in 1966 of a state law (see Index No. 097) requiring that textbooks deal fairly with the treatment of minorities, this city instituted mechanisms for dealing with such treatment in the textbooks it adopts.

I. The textbook adoption procedure for the city has normally consisted of these five steps:

   A. Decision to replace currently adopted books. (Books are usually adopted for a five-year period.)

   B. Request for examples of appropriate books from publishers.

   C. Appointment of selection committees composed of teachers, supervisors, and administrators for each subject and grade.

   D. Action by selection committees to establish criteria, meet with publishers' representatives, examine and judge books, and make recommendations, with reasons therefor reported, to the Superintendent of Schools.

   E. Recommendation by the Superintendent to the Board of Education for adoption of textbooks.

II. In 1964, by action of the Board of Education, a sixth step was instituted. After selection committees have made their recommendations, the Department of Intergroup

Relations of the Division of School-Community Relations makes careful analyses of the listed books in terms of twenty criteria developed by the Department. The criteria require positive (rather than mere absence of negative) treatment of minority groups. The Intergroup Relations Department then makes recommendations to the Superintendent, who makes use of the recommendations in his determination of what textbooks should be presented to the Board of Education for adoption.

Index No. 084: The State Board of Education Directs Adoption of Elementary-Level Textbooks

A very large committee makes recommendations of textbooks to be adopted on a five-year rotating schedule.

I. Each of the nine State Board of Education members appoints a State Evaluation Chairman and with his help selects from four to seven additional members to serve with the chairman on the committee. The members and chairmen must be experienced and active educators in the state, not directly or indirectly connected with publishing houses which will submit programs to the committees. At least half the members of each committee must be teachers, and wide cross-sectional representation is recommended.

II. At an organizational meeting, the nine State Evaluation Chairmen:

- A. Determine cooperatively the objectives of adoption
- B. Establish time schedules for evaluation
- C. Develop criteria to be used for the evaluation
- D. Recommend categories of subject area
- E. Define methods of balloting and procedures to be followed

III. The Director of Elementary Education of the State Department of Public Instruction makes arrangements for formal presentations to the State Committee by publishers' representatives. Time allotments are equitable and cannot be exceeded.

IV. Committees evaluate all materials submitted by publishers, applying the criteria developed by the State Evaluation Chairmen. Each member ranks each item considered in order of preference and a committee consensus of preference is developed.

V. Each committee notifies the State Superintendent of Public Instruction which items it considers should be eliminated from further consideration. Vote of five of the nine committees effects such elimination.

VI. The State Evaluation Chairmen consolidate the recommendations of the nine committees and submit the resulting report to the State Board of Education.

VII. The State Board votes on adoption at an open meeting; tallies of votes must be visible to spectators. From three to five textbooks per grade and subject are adopted for a five-year period.

Index No. 009: A City Located in a State which Adopts Elementary Textbooks (084) Adopts Secondary Texts

Committees, sometimes including townspeople, recommend books to be put on a multiple list, on a four-year rotating schedule.

I. Each year a Selection Committee is appointed for each subject area in which adoptions will be made, with the school district's subject-area consultants as chairmen, and department heads and other teachers from all ten schools as members. It is possible also to include interested community representatives.

II. During the summer textbook publishers are informed of the areas in which adoptions will be made, procedures for making presentations about books to committee members, and procedures for submitting examples of textbooks for evaluation.

III. From October to February, Selection Committees make complete and thorough examinations of each book submitted, according to general criteria supplied by the city and more specific ones developed by the committee. Procedures for evaluation may include:

A. Consultation with specialists

B. Trial use in classrooms

C. Meetings with publisher's representatives

IV. In April the committees make final recommendation to the Assistant Superintendent for Instruction of up to five books per course of study for adoption for the next four years. The Assistant Superintendent for Instruction advises the Board of Education, which makes final adoptions.

Index No. 005: A Nonadoption State Develops a Comprehensive Curriculum Aid

Detailed analyses of twenty elementary school mathematics texts are available to any school in the state as tools in selection, in a project sponsored jointly by the U.S. Office of Education and a state education authority.

I. The project staff selected twenty major basic mathematics texts, with their teacher's guides, for analysis and preparation of system documents--an analysis sheet, the pupil text page, and the teacher manual page for each page in each of the twenty texts.

II. A. Specialists in mathematics education developed a Content Authority List of more than three hundred content items, classified under seven general mathematics topics. Content analysts, professors of mathematics at colleges and universities in the state who were trained for this task by the senior editor of the project, assigned codes to each lesson in each book on the basis of this analysis tool. They also indicated grade level--school year and month--for which each lesson is intended.

B. On the basis of a Behavior Authority List, which consisted of fifteen hundred pupil objectives developed from the results of mathematics curriculum research at a university in the state, seven classroom teachers, trained and supervised by the authors of the list, assigned a code to every lesson in every text. The Behavior Authority List is logically related to the Content Authority List; it concerns eleven mathematics topics in five major levels of skill-activity difficulty.

C. Two classroom teachers, trained and supervised by the project staff, assigned problem-type codes to each page of every teacher's manual, identified technical vocabulary and symbolism in each series, preparing an alphabetized vocabulary-symbolism index for the series, and indicated pre- and post-text instructional activities in each series.

D. A description of the salient features of each book was prepared by the project staff, checked with the publishers, and filed at the end of the system documents for the text.

III. A. Coded information is stored in a computer in the state's Bureau of Educational Data Processing. Authority lists also are stored in the computer, where they can be easily updated if need be. Indices and other search information can also easily be generated by computer.

B. Computer-printed analysis pages, pupil text pages, and teacher manual pages were microfilmed for permanent storage and to prepare aperture cards.

IV. At the state education authority headquarters and at (so far) two regional centers, school districts in the state may receive "general," "modified," and "in-depth" services ranging from answering queries about approaches and features in mathematics texts to assisting in a comprehensive study of the school's current mathematics curriculum, preparation of a new curriculum guide, and selecting appropriate materials to implement the newly designed curriculum. In addition to the complete analyses and files, users of the system, whether at headquarters or in the regional centers, have the benefit of the advice of a mathematics curriculum adviser.

Index No. 010: A State Adopts Books at the Elementary Level

Committees in school districts all over the state assist the State Curriculum Commission in preliminary evaluation of textbooks, which are adopted on a four- to eight-year rotating schedule.

I. The State Board of Education determines the grade or grades in which textbooks will be adopted and appoints a State Curriculum Commission to recommend books for adoption.

II. Publishers are informed of adoption plans and asked to submit for examination sufficient quantities of texts which conform to criteria established by the State Curriculum Commission. The Curriculum Commission members and consultants review the books submitted and select ones to be given a more extensive evaluation.

III. The Curriculum Commission appoints advisers in school districts throughout the state to direct the preliminary evaluation of books selected for further evaluation. Advisers appoint selection committees of classroom teachers and school administrators representing all grades in all elementary schools in a school district. They evaluate books in terms of criteria and rating sheets supplied by the Curriculum Commission. At least five members of a selection committee review each book and, after group discussion, a summary rating report (on forms provided) is sent to the Commission.

IV. On the basis of the information obtained from the reviews, the Commission makes recommendations to the State Board of Education. The State Board adopts one or, in some cases, two or three basic books (for students at different levels of competence) for each subject and grade, as well as lists of supplementary texts for most subjects.

Index No. 028: Textbook Selection in a Large City in a State (010) which Adopts Elementary Texts

Large representative committees of teachers are responsible for selecting basic and supplemental books and periodicals for classroom use.

I. Secondary Level

A. Books

1. Subject-matter committees representing each school meet to establish criteria for selection of basic textbooks and workbooks and supplementary texts.

2. Publishers are asked to submit books which meet the criteria and to discuss their books with committee members.

3. Committee members examine all materials submitted and try them in their classrooms.

4. At general committee meetings unsuitable texts are eliminated. Remaining ones receive more intensive trial and examination. A final selection of basic books for a subject and grade usually consists of three books (and their accompanying workbooks or manuals), for students with above-

average, average, and below-average reading ability. Other books may be recommended as supplemental texts.

5. Selected books are recommended to the Board of Education for adoption.

B. Periodicals

To add a periodical to the list of "Classroom Sets of Periodicals," which are considered supplementary text material to ensure currency of information, at least two teachers in a school must sign a recommendation, to be approved by the Coordinator, Curriculum, and then submitted to the Board of Education, through the Bureau of Libraries and Textbooks, for adoption.

II. Elementary Level

A. Books

1. Basic textbooks are adopted (with the assistance of evaluating groups all over the state) and supplied by the State Board of Education.

2. The committee which serves as a state evaluating group, consisting of about thirty-five elementary school teachers and administrators, representing every geographic location in the city, also

selects supplementary textbooks and workbooks for use in the schools of the city.

a. Publishers deposit with the Teachers Professional Library copies of proposed supplementary texts.

b. The staff of the library sees that each book is reviewed by at least two members of the committee, who also try the book in several classrooms.

c. If the two reporting teachers disagree, a third teacher is asked to review and try the book.

d. The committee discusses all reviews before making a recommendation to the Board of Education.

B. Magazines

1. Suggestions for additions to the "Classroom Sets of Magazines" list

are submitted by teachers, administrators, and librarians to the same committee which selects books.

2. Sample issues are examined and evaluated by at least five members of the committee, and, after group discussion, final recommendation is made to the Board of Education.

Index No. 019: An Adoption State Channels Evaluations from Schools to a Small Selection Committee

A committee collects evaluations from teachers and supervisors and recommends to the State Board of Education a number of books to be adopted in each subject, on a two- to six-year rotating schedule.

I. The State Board of Education appoints a four-man Textbook and Curriculum Committee to be responsible for selection of textbooks.

II. The Committee, with the assistance of the staff of the State Board of Education, develops criteria for evaluating books in areas to be considered in a given year. Books are adopted for six years, but in certain subject areas one-third of the books on the multiple list are adopted every two years.

III. The Committee appoints persons to evaluate books in each area, selecting them from the supervisory and teaching personnel across the state.

IV. Formal hearings are scheduled at which publisher's representatives may make presentations on books being submitted for consideration before each Committee member and each group of persons selected to evaluate texts.

V. Groups of persons who evaluate texts summarize their evaluations for the Committee which, on the basis of those summaries and its own evaluations, recommends a multiple list of books in each subject under consideration to the State Board of Education.

VI. The State Board adopts a multiple list of books and notifies publishers and Division (local) Superintendents of its action.

Index No. 055: A County School Division in an Adoption State (019) Selects Books for Local Use

Committee members decide which of the books on the state's multiple list should be adopted for local use.

I. A committee consisting of teachers representing several schools in the division, citizens from the community, and members of the staff of the division considers each of the books adopted for use in schools throughout the state for a given area, using specified selection criteria.

II. The evaluations are summarized and the recommendations made to the local School Board to adopt one or more of the books on the state list, and occasionally supplemental books not included on the state list, for use in the schools in the division.

III. Books adopted by the School Board become the official books for six years.

Index No. 041: A Regulatory Nonadoption State

A state which leaves evaluation and selection to local districts unifies the process by means of central regulations.

I. State law requires:

- A. The State Board of Education to prescribe rules and regulations governing the choice of textbooks for use in the public schools of the state
- B. Schools to report their textbook selections to the State Board for approval and inclusion on an open list
- C. The State Board to negotiate with publishers statewide prices for listed books
- D. That an approved book remain on the list for at least four years

II. The State Board, in carrying out the law:

- A. Prescribes criteria against which textbooks must be evaluated.
- B. Defines a textbook as "any book or other material, including but not limited to, printed books, recordings, video presentations or films, to be used as the basic reference for the implementation of a course and that alone or in combination with other materials will be used by all of the students in the course "

C. Makes recommendations concerning evaluating primary sources and controversial materials before introducing them into courses

D. Recommends that local districts add to state-supplied criteria, perhaps by means of discussion in advisory committees; depend heavily upon the judgment of classroom teachers; consider in-service training for teachers about to use a new textbook; and consider pilot use of newly recommended materials, particularly when they have been selected under the "controversial material" criteria

Index No. 096: A School District in a Regulatory Nonadoption State (041) Selects Textbooks

Three types of evaluation for three different situations.

I. Initial Evaluation

- A. Books to be considered are sent by the Office of Instructional Supervisors to selected teachers who comment on their general impression of the book and suggest further action in connection with it--further consideration by a textbook selection committee, immediate listing as an approved supplementary text, or rejection for that school district's use.
- B. When further consideration by a committee is recommended, the Instructional Supervisor concerned convenes a committee of teachers to evaluate the book in detail and make a recommendation to the Superintendent of Schools.
- C. Final decision is in the hands of the Superintendent of Schools, including making necessary arrangements for state approval and listing.

II. Re-evaluation of Books in Use

- A. A small committee devises an evaluation form which goes to each teacher using the book.

B. A meeting of representatives from each school is held to consider readoption of the book. Representatives of schools where the book has been used bring summaries of classroom teachers' evaluations.

C. After discussion of teachers' reactions and examination of the book, a recommendation is made to readopt the book or to discontinue the use of it.

D. As in initial selection, final decision is in the hands of the Superintendent of Schools, including any necessary arrangements for state approval and listing.

III. Evaluation for a Specific Curriculum

In the course of in-service training sessions for new programs (for instance, a four-day session on Family Life and Sex Education for more than twenty teachers), textbooks and other instructional materials are evaluated for use in a specific curriculum.

Index No. 001: An Adoption State Calls Upon Two Professional Committees

A three-level process for adopting a multiple listing of textbooks for each area, on a six-year rotating schedule.

I. A. The State Board of Education receives nominations from local boards of education and appoints a Courses of Study Committee in two sections, an elementary and a secondary section:

Elementary:	Secondary:
2 teachers from each grade	3 teachers from each subject-matter field
3 elementary principals	3 secondary principals
2 elementary supervisors	2 secondary supervisors
1 college professor of elementary education	1 college professor of secondary education

B. The Courses of Study Committee conducts continuing studies and evaluations of courses taught in the state and prepares contents of the courses, considering:

1. Required basic content
2. Texts used and available
3. Educational objective of the course

4. Changing scientific, technological, and cultural developments

5. Established facts of American history, tradition, and patriotism

C. At least every two years, the committee reports to the State Superintendent of Education and to the members of the State Textbook Committee with respect to:

1. Compulsory minimum content of courses of study

2. Recommended revisions of courses, materials, subject content, and treatment in specific courses and subject areas.

II. A. The State Textbook Committee consists of twenty members. The State Board of Education appoints eight elementary teachers and eight secondary teachers, nominated by local school superintendents, and one state college professor and one state university professor, nominated by the State Superintendent of Education. The Governor appoints two members who have not been employed in the field of education. Committee members must file an affidavit that they have no connection with a publisher or any businessman which could constitute conflict of interest, and that they will reveal the findings of the committee only to the State Board of Education. Committee members are paid an honorarium and expenses.

B. The State Textbook Committee meets as often as necessary to evaluate textbooks in light of criteria set by the Courses of Study Committee. Rating scales and check sheets are developed to record evaluations.

C. The committee recommends at least six textbooks on each subject for adoption in each grade, unless fewer than six acceptable textbooks are available.

III. A. The State Board of Education announces for a period of thirty days the proposed adoptions and the time and place scheduled for a meeting of the State Board to adopt. Adoptions may be made only at a public meeting, and the public must be allowed a reasonable amount of time to be heard concerning any recommended book.

B. The State Board of Education shall adopt from among the textbooks recommended by the State Textbook Committee at least four adoptions for each course in each grade unless the Textbook

Committee has recommended fewer than four. The books become the adopted texts for the schools of the state for a period of six years.

Index No. 135: A School System in a Nonadoption State Substitutes a Variety of Media for the Single Textbook

Cooperatively developed curricula are implemented by means of a master collection of several kinds of media.

I. A plan, started in the early sixties, to make libraries available in each elementary school and to give in-service training in library-media center use, resulted in teacher requests to review curriculum. A pattern was established for such review and for implementation of new curricula, as follows:

A. Research committees investigate current curriculum trends to define basic objectives and to work out the scope and sequence of topics to be covered.

B. A larger faculty committee defines the program in more detail and makes suggestions for implementation, grade by grade.

C. A "pilot school" tries the program for a year and it is introduced, with whatever revisions seem necessary, to the whole system--or abandoned. A year-long program of workshops every school year ensures that all teachers are informed about and contribute to new curriculum development and keep up with suggestions as to methods, media, services, and activities.

II. A basic concept in this cooperative curriculum development has been the abandonment of the single textbook for a variety of media.

- A. Media for use in implementing the program are basically teacher selected. Suggestions may be made by committees and by pilot school faculties and sessions are held to introduce teachers to new media. However, the teacher is the final arbiter of what he will use in the classroom.
- B. The school district maintains a large collection of media, for the most part housed in individual school libraries but centrally cataloged to facilitate district-wide use, which the teacher may use or ask to have augmented as his plans require. Materials for the media collection are selected in a variety of ways.
    1. In the case of films, it is sometimes possible to have district-wide "film shows" at which all teachers of a given grade and subject may comment on a large number of films.
    2. The basic library collections are maintained by library specialists; special

library books are selected as are other media.

3. In the course of trial of new programs, committee members or pilot school faculty may see that certain materials are obtained for pilot use.

4. After curricula have been installed, teachers or curriculum specialists may request that the Educational Development Center obtain materials for preview and may try them out in the classroom, thus obtaining student opinion. All previews are formally reported upon on special evaluation forms which are kept on file at the Educational Development Center. If a teacher requests preview of an item on which an evaluation file exists, he is given the benefit of the previous reviews before deciding finally that he wishes to preview the item himself.

SELECTION OF SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

The survey brought forth examples of selection processes for library books, for audiovisual software such as films and tapes (with most attention given to sixteen-millimeter films for classroom use or for transmission by television), and for maps, models, exhibits, pictures, and other such display materials.

It would appear that almost all these materials are housed in central collections, easily accessible to classroom teachers (and students, certainly in the case of books and more and more in the case of other materials) but serving many classrooms. It is for media centers, state, regional, and local, that most of the selection descriptions received are designed.

Two professional organizations, the American Association of School Librarians and the Department of Audiovisual Instruction of the National Education Association, have cooperated to produce (very recently) standards for school media systems, including personnel requirements, budget requirements, space and equipment requirements; scope, including relationships among local, regional, and state centers; selection and organization suggestions; and other considerations which make the media center a real resource for teaching and learning. In this spirit (and already based on these standards in some cases) some state education authorities supply standards for their schools to follow in establishing media centers (including at least broad hints on dealing with questions of controversial materials).

Selection of materials for inclusion in these centers is a matter of considerable importance. Persons in charge of such centers are likely to bring experience and expertise to the problem, and certainly to be aware of the publications which list books and other materials considered basic for a media collection. Further than that, there are numbers of sources of reviews and listings, in general periodicals, in periodicals designed specifically to serve educators, in professional journals, in yearbooks and special bibliographies, which assist in selection of general additions to collections, or in obtaining materials to serve special purposes. There are even "guides to the guides"--listings, sometimes with descriptions, of catalogs, bibliographies, and periodicals which are useful in the selection of library books and nonprint media materials.

Media centers frequently enlist the aid of classroom teachers in final evaluation of materials which are being considered as additions to the collection, not only increasing the probability of choosing actually useful materials but also giving teachers an opportunity to learn more about what is available to them. When materials can be given trial use in classrooms, students' opinions can be taken into consideration in purchase decisions. This can be arranged more easily when distributors and suppliers are able to lend materials to centers long enough to allow trial, or when (as has been increasingly the case under federal legislation) funds can be earmarked for the purchase of trial materials.

The previewing and evaluation needed to make final purchase decisions make serious demands of time and effort, and the survey brought forth examples of attempts to alleviate the problems by means of cooperative evaluation projects, perhaps undertaken by a state education authority, by all the school systems in a unified geographical area, or by a librarians association. Sometimes these cooperative evaluations take into account curriculum requirements which apply to all members of the group. They may, however, be oriented around a topic, whether or not an effort is made to select coordinated materials.

Multimedia catalogs and guides do exist, prepared by state education authorities or by professional associations, to assist in selection of various materials for teaching a concept or adding a dimension to the curriculum--rounding out the teaching on minorities, for instance, or correlating humanities information with the science curriculum. Curriculum guides prepared by state authorities for local school use may suggest materials (in addition to textbooks) to implement the curriculum. And some authorities, county or local, issue general criteria to use in evaluating all instructional materials, with the aim of achieving balance and coherence.

It will be immediately apparent, in the examples that follow, that selection processes for supplementary materials tend to be less structured than those for textbooks--for one thing, no example occurred where actual selection mechanisms were prescribed by law.

Index No. 020: A County School System "Polices" its Media Collection

Teachers receive honoraria and professional-growth credit for participating during the summer in a county-wide media review.

Sponsor: A county school system

Duration: 1964-

The purpose of the summer review of media is to add new materials to the collection in the county's Educational Materials Center and to remove materials which are no longer useful. A three-year rotating schedule of reviews is followed, with seven or eight curriculum areas a year coming up for review.

The staff of the Educational Materials Center requests review materials from suppliers and prepares lists of currently owned materials. They invite teachers to apply for membership on appropriate selection teams and make up those teams from among the applicants. They schedule the team meetings and coordinate the team activities.

Each team is composed of from five to seven teachers of the proper grade level or subject matter who have not been on previous evaluation teams. They work morning or afternoon for about a week at $3.00 an hour. At the discretion of their local school boards, they may also receive in-service professional-growth credits at the rate of one unit for each sixteen hours worked.

Teams evaluate the materials on the basis of general criteria set by the Educational Materials Center and specific criteria which they set themselves. They then prepare a recommendation for the County Board of Education, indicating new materials to be bought immediately and ones to be bought when funds become available. They also recommend to the Educational Materials Center materials which should be discarded as obsolete or erroneous and advise on proper cross-indexing, grade-level placement, and subject-area listings of materials in or about to be added to the collection.

Index No. 015: Film Selection for State Film Libraries

> To avoid waste of time, the state requires films submitted for preview be no more than two years from copyright date.
>
> Sponsor: A state education authority
>
> Duration: Ongoing

A "preview coordinator," working with subject-field consultants of the state education authority, selects films from producers' lists to be previewed.

The subject-field consultants designate preview committees from school and college personnel in the state. Members view films individually; they complete a "State Department of Education Film Evaluation Form" for each one, to be sent to subject-field consultants.

Media consultants, film-library managers, subject-field consultants, and the director and the assistant director of the state's Division of Curriculum Development make final decisions as to purchase of films for the state libraries.

Index No. 030: A Media Center Catalogs User Opinions of Software

Film users must report on each film they use for a summary report.

Sponsor: U. S. Office of Education, under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

Duration: Ongoing

A media center serving twenty-four local school systems with a large collection of software makes items available to teachers who will review them as instructed and report their reviews.

Specific questions to ask before selecting an item for use are supplied, as are instructions to test the students before and after the item has been used in the classroom, to assess the usefulness of the material. The teacher also must complete an "Evaluation Report" and return it with the item.

Information thus received is treated statistically to show the ratio of favorable reviews to total reviews, with indication of the statistical significance of the ratio and an indication of the curriculum areas in which the item earned favorable reviews. These data are compiled in a "Media Evaluation Report" for the guidance of future users of the collection, as well as to suggest local school acquisitions, and to provide critical review for film manufacturers.

Index No. 042: A County-Wide Filmstrip Review

The county school-librarians association cooperates in the review of filmstrips.

Sponsor: A county school-librarians association

Duration: 1967-

On the basis of needs expressed by teachers in schools in the county, librarians obtain from producers filmstrips that relate to curriculum needs. Using guidelines cooperatively developed by the librarians association, one of the librarians reviews each filmstrip and prepares a statement for the quarterly publication which the association issues to its members and to interested school personnel.

Index No. 054: Curriculum-Oriented Selection for a City's Audiovisual Libraries

Audiovisual materials are selected by committees of classroom teachers in terms of curriculum needs.

Sponsor: A city school system

Duration: Ongoing

The Assistant Superintendent for Instruction appoints Audiovisual Education Advisory Committees, selecting experienced teachers recognized for skill in using visuals. Each year there shall be some members who are carried over from the previous years.

The committees represent the three levels of elementary education and each subject-matter field in secondary education. Elementary education committees have three teachers from each grade level and a supervisor as members; secondary education committees have three members who teach the seventh grade, three who teach the eighth grade, and one from each high school.

Once a year committees review the audiovisual materials already in the collection for continued relevance to the curriculum and for timeliness, and to determine where there are gaps in the coverage of the curriculum. They also preview films and make suggestions for additions to the collections, completing for each a cooperatively developed film-evaluation card. Their recommendations are submitted to curriculum coordinators who are responsible for seeing that teaching tools have city-wide utilization and who, therefore, make final decisions.

Index No. 045: Cooperative Selection for ETV

A program director has "dissatisfied users" choose replacements for films shown in instructional television.

Sponsor: Member schools and a state education authority

Duration: Ongoing

Member schools (forty public districts and fifty-five parochial schools) send teachers to serve on central committees dealing with seven major curriculum areas who review and comment on programs transmitted during the past year by a cooperative educational television station.

Committees whose reactions are favorable are disbanded. Others are constituted into selection committees who meet to preview and discuss films and video tapes and make recommendations for the coming year's television programs. They may recommend use of material they have previewed, or give specifications of what they would like to see transmitted. In the latter case, the station makes every effort to obtain suitable material; if none can be found, they produce materials to the committee's specifications.

The committees for selection meet about eight times each over a six-week period. Their schools or systems arrange for and pay substitutes for their classes, and pay any expenses incurred in connection with committee work.

Index No. 089: Evaluation of Nonprint Media to Implement a New Approach to the Curriculum

A state prepares guides to and kits of resources to relate cultural enrichment materials to courses in English, science, social studies, industrial arts, and home economics.

Sponsors: U. S. Office of Education and a state education authority.

Duration: 1962-

Participating schools submitted descriptions of their courses of study to personnel of the state education authority, who studied them to see where the arts and the humanities might be integrated into the regular subject matter. Preliminary selection among a very large collection of materials was made in light of those deliberations. Then nine teachers selected further among the materials, relating appropriate ones to lesson plans which they devised.

Kits consisting of the lesson plans and the materials selected to implement them were placed in the cooperating schools for trial and evaluation. Students in participating schools and in control schools completed rating scales on works of art and were interviewed as to their attitudes toward the arts, and teachers submitted to the state education authority their reactions, evaluations, and recommendations concerning materials and lesson plans.

Offerings were revised in light of the above evaluations to arrive at lesson plans, and lists of materials to implement them, which could be disseminated throughout the state.

Index No. 131: Introduction of a New Medium

A media center tries film loops in five member schools.

Sponsor: U. S. Office of Education, under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, a state education authority, and local schools in the region.

Duration: Unknown

Film loops were obtained on loan from producers for a semester and divided among teachers in five participating schools. Teachers were informed of criteria against which they would be asked to evaluate the film loops at the end of the semester. These criteria include estimates of appropriateness, effect, and quality of the materials, and their usefulness (particularly as compared with filmstrips) in the curriculum. Also supplied to the teacher were a rating scale on which he could record his own reactions to the use of the loops and his observation of student acceptance of them, and a rating scale to be administered to students with whom they had used the loops. All evaluations were of the loop system in general, not of specific loops, and the information was used by the media center as a basis for decision as to whether to add loops to its collection.

Index No. 092: A City School System Adds to Its Libraries

Teachers, parents, and students can suggest titles for the school libraries.

Sponsor: A city school system

Duration: Ongoing

Secondary Level: Two committees of librarians, one for junior high schools and one for senior high schools, have final say on books and periodicals for school libraries. Suggestions for books are sought from administrators, teachers, librarians, students, and parents.

Each librarian in the system is responsible for the review of two books a week, by himself or by teachers and administrators he selects. Books normally receive two reviews, though some are reviewed only once. Teachers may ask to review particular books.

Reviewers prepare written reviews for the Bureau of Library and Textbooks. If reviews are widely discrepant, a third review is sought. If a review from a teacher who has asked to review a specific book raises a question, a teacher in another school is asked to review the book also.

Each committee of librarians meets four times a year to consider the written reviews and to select books to be listed, with annotations, on the approved buying list. The committees also enter, review, or cancel subscriptions to periodicals once a year on their own responsibility but with the advice of teachers and administrators.

Elementary Level: The Elementary Schools Book Committee (which also deals with textbooks and other classroom aids under state adoption regulations) is responsible for selection of library books and periodicals.

All books submitted by publishers are reviewed, but priority is given to those which have been recommended by teachers and administrators. Two members of the committee read each book and they are used in classes to obtain teachers' and students' evaluations.

If teachers' evaluations are discrepant, the process is repeated and all results discussed by small groups within the committee before the committee meets to make recommendations for the purchase of books.

The committee obtains suggestions for additions to and deletions from the "approved library magazine list" from teachers, administrators, and librarians. Members of the committee examine the magazines and, after committee discussion, the list is prepared.

Index No. 039: Nonprint Materials for a Specific Topic

A group of librarians decides to evaluate all media available on a given topic, starting with Afro-American culture.

Sponsor: A state education authority

Duration: 1968-

More than twenty librarians and audiovisual specialists representing public schools, private schools, public libraries, library schools, media centers, and the state education authority, organized for the purpose of attacking the problem of evaluating media for use with children and young people.

After investigation of various response forms for use in evaluating media, the committee decided upon a "universal" one which permitted some variation to accommodate characteristics of individual media but which would permit uniform reporting.

The committee chose Afro-American culture as the first area in which media would be evaluated. A subcommittee was selected for each type of medium, and chairmen were instructed to obtain materials from producers and also to incorporate into their reports pertinent and recent reviews which had been developed for a large school system represented in the group or for the State Division of School Libraries.

The evaluation reports were edited and prepared for printing and distribution to school personnel by the members of the committee and by the branch in the region of the State Division of School Libraries. The report will be ready in late 1969.

Index No. 091: A State "Adopts" Library Books and Audiovisual Materials for Local Schools

Schools may use state funds for the purchase of library books and audiovisual software only if the materials appear on a state-approved list.

Sponsor: A state education authority

Duration: Ongoing

Elementary books: Each member of an Elementary Materials Committee of ten members--reading specialists, supervisors, professors of education or library science, state board members and officials--reads all books submitted by publishers for inclusion on the elementary school library list and prepares a confidential written evaluation of each one. These evaluations are discussed during a week-long meeting to arrive at a consensus as to what books to recommend for the state-approved list.

High School and Adult Books: Two members of the High School Materials Committee and one high school librarian read and prepare confidential written reports on each book submitted for inclusion on the approved high school library list. Approximately one hundred local librarians participate in the selection process.

The High School Materials Committee, like the Elementary one, meets for a week to discuss the evaluations and make recommendations for the approved list.

Professional Books: Members of the staff of the state education authority review professional books and make recommendations for the approved list.

Audiovisual Materials: Members of the staffs of the state education authority and the state Bureau of Teaching Materials review audiovisual materials for inclusion in the state's free teaching-materials service and on the state-approved list.

Index No. 022: Media Selection on a Coordinated Curriculum Basis

City-wide committees are responsible for selection of all materials to be added to media centers.

Sponsor: A local school district

Duration: Ongoing

The Superintendent of Schools appoints committees, made up of principals, teachers, librarians, and subject-matter or grade-level consultants, to select all materials to be added to the instructional media centers or used with texts in classrooms. The areas of responsibility of each committee are carefully detailed. There are two elementary-level committees, one to select classroom learning materials and one to select library-media center learning materials. Each may be divided into subcommittees representing grade levels for certain selection tasks.

Secondary-level committees represent broad curricular areas; they may operate in subcommittees by grade level (English, homemaking, mathematics, and social sciences), subtopic (science and music), or sex of student (physical education and safety). For art education, for each foreign language, and for business education and industrial arts, all teachers serve as the selection committee, with the librarians and the consultants.

The committees are charged with the responsibility for "the acquisition of a well-balanced and coordinated set of learning materials for use of students and teachers." Attendance at committee and subcommittee meetings and preview sessions is considered sufficiently important to make it necessary to send an alternate if one cannot attend.

Index No. 003: A State Supplies Schools with Film Reviews

To assist audiovisual directors and teachers in the state to keep up with new materials as they are produced, a state education authority institutes a review system, starting with films.

Sponsor: A state education authority

Duration: 1963-

The state education department staff devised a loosely structured response form designed to elicit overall judgments and the reasons for them, recommendations and cautions concerning the use of a film, and straight descriptive information from reviewers.

A group of approximately one hundred teachers, representative of every section of the state and every type of school organization in the state, were selected to evaluate films. They initially met in groups in approximately ten locations in the state for instruction and practice.

Each film received a minimum of three reviews. Reports were synthesized to form one statement about each film. These statements were printed in a guide distributed to all schools in the state.

On the basis of initial experiences, it was decided that more thorough training of the evaluating teachers was required and that a more structured response form was required, one which lent itself to the preparation of responses for computer storage.

EQUIPMENT SELECTION

Equipment selection often requires two decisions--whether a school or district should introduce a new type of equipment and, if so, what make and model to buy. Such considerations, of course, vary considerably in complexity, and it is likely that for major installations advice and assistance must be sought from consultants--perhaps engineers. There are, however, some manuals to assist in at least the preliminary decisions about major equipment.

For simpler installations, after considerations such as availability of suitable useful "software" and need for special skills to operate the equipment have been investigated and satisfactorily resolved, the equipment itself comes under scrutiny. When that occurs, unfortunately expertise and physical facilities needed to make comparative tests of equipment are usually lacking. Thus much audiovisual equipment selection consists of so-called "hands on" evaluation--the potential user tries one or two models and buys the one he likes. He may consult a colleague or a published selection aid.

Some information is available from professional and trade organizations on various types of equipment, and the EPIE Institute includes comparative descriptions and evaluations of audiovisual equipment in its publications and services. Other aids, based on more-or-less extensive evaluation, may be made available by central agencies--a state or a large city education authority, a testing facility established by an organization whose members make extensive use of equipment, a commercial testing laboratory, or an agency with incidental but extensive educational responsibilities. (One of the most succinct and useful equipment evaluation reports to come up in the survey is issued by the central office of a Protestant church.) These aids, based on evaluation undertaken for the purpose, typically take the form of criteria against which to compare equipment, or comparative catalogs--though one very interesting one is a series of tests for nonelectronically oriented language teachers to make on--and with--language laboratories before paying for them. Some states set fairly detailed standards, concerning such factors as performance, convenience, and durability, below which equipment may not fall if it is to be bought with state or state-administered federal funds. Such standards are useful also as guidelines when local funds will be used, of course; they and others designed only as guidelines are sometimes compilations of reports from typical users who have given the equipment a trial use or have participated in a workshop on it. In at least one workshop, described in some detail later, the participants used their newly developed criteria to prepare a comparative catalog.

Such comparative catalogs are more often developed on the basis of laboratory testing, though field test results may be included. When a large enough population is available for survey, catalogs may be summaries of reports of users. Some catalogs merely give the results of identical tests for each item of equipment, leaving all value judgments to the catalog user. Others venture to advise and compare, particularly if designed primarily for use within the administrative circle which caused the catalog to be prepared.

It should be mentioned that some guidelines are prepared by experts on the basis of experience and knowledge rather than as a result of formal tests and surveys. An example could be cited of a set of standards and guidelines available in one state to schools which may want to supplement television instruction. The guidelines define the two major supplemental systems and compare then as to educational needs to be supplied, technical considerations, and cost factors. Instructions for making the necessary legal arrangements for the more independent of the two systems are given in detail. The guide was prepared by persons in the state who are experienced in the use of all types of educational media.

Finally, it should be mentioned that economics and feasibility, always and properly influential in the selection process, sometimes must become overriding considerations. A case in point is a guide to videotape recorders issued by one state department of education to schools which expect to use the state's videotape services. Since so far there is no compatibility among the many available videotape systems, the state felt constrained to advise schools to buy only the brand of equipment which the state uses.

The examples which follow describe in more detail how some of the evaluation aids were developed, how they are sometimes supplemented, and how institutions without access to such aids evaluate equipment. It must be said that comparatively few examples of systematic equipment evaluation processes came forth in the course of this survey.

Index No. 086: A Statewide Committee Looks at Equipment

A special state committee examines and tries out equipment for information of all state agencies.

Sponsor: A state purchase authority

Duration: Ongoing

A committee chosen from faculties of state and community colleges and the state university, and from the state's budget and standards committees, is charged with the responsibility of appraising equipment on behalf of all state agencies; resultant information is available on request to local school districts and to private schools.

All equipment is tried out in the field. Frequently the committee meets with producers to discuss and try out equipment and then places the equipment in the field. Reports on trials are discussed at a committee meeting and recommendations are made to the state purchasing authority.

Index No. 056: A Field Check Manual

A state education authority assists teachers in
the evaluation of language laboratories.

Sponsor: A state education authority

Duration: 1964-

On the basis that carefully selected and carefully manufactured and installed equipment may require adjustment before it operates at its best, a state education authority has devised a "Field Check Manual for Language Laboratories: A Series of Tests Which a Non-Technical Person Can Conduct to Verify Specifications." It is recommended that the field check be made prior to final payment for the laboratory to determine whether further testing by a qualified technician is required.

The manual contains a series of simple tests, to be conducted by a teacher alone or with the cooperation of students. The teacher must operate the laboratory and look or listen for certain effects. To check frequency response, he must read a list of one-syllable words through the equipment to students who are to record exactly what they hear. He must answer questions about "downtime" and maintenance service. He is advised to compare specifically the specifications in the order for the laboratory with the equipment installed.

Information for interpreting most of the tests is contained in the manual itself; unusual results may have to be referred to state authorities. The tests were devised by a consultant from the State Bureau of Engineering and the State Supervisor of Modern Foreign Languages, with assistance from a bulletin on language laboratory facilities from the U. S. Office of Education.

Index No. 037: Selection in a University

The Educational Media Services at a university select audiovisual equipment for purchase.

Sponsor: A university affiliated with a religious denomination

Duration: Ongoing

Staff members of the university Communications Services Division (of which Educational Media Services are a part) apply their particular expertise to the scrutiny of equipment under consideration. Each person who examines a piece of equipment records quantitative data, checked for accuracy, on an "Electronic Media Evaluation Report," which requires information on technical characteristics, expected maintenance requirements, ease of operation, and general engineering quality. Decisions to purchase or not are made on the basis of these data.

Index No. 052: Selection in a City System

A large city school system subjects audiovisual equipment to tests and field trials.

Sponsor: A city board of education

Duration: Ongoing

Equipment is obtained and subjected to tests of electrical, mechanical, and thermal operation, construction features, and safety factors. Convenience in instructional situations and usefulness for various specific school needs are judged, as are maintenance factors--accessibility of mechanism, availability of parts, need for special tools, etc. Equipment which warrants further investigation is sent to schools for field tests. A committee makes a report, on the basis of results of the two types of tests, to the Bureau of Supplies.

Index No. 128: A Dual-Purpose Workshop

A state arranges for guidelines for selecting equipment and appraisals of locally available models.

Sponsor: Audiovisual center of a state education authority

Duration: 1966-1967

A team of fourteen teachers, librarians, and audiovisual specialists (or persons who assumed two of those roles) met for two weeks in an Audiovisual Workshop to establish criteria for evaluating projectors of various kinds, record players, tape recorders, and projection screens. Local distributors made the equipment available and demonstrated its use. The participants then worked with, examined, took apart, reassembled, and otherwise handled the equipment in order not only to appraise it but also to devise a form for use in appraising any audiovisual equipment.

The two goals were met, with a resultant report that includes criteria sheets for use in evaluating audiovisual equipment and results of such evaluations for locally available equipment.

Index No. 011: Laboratory Tests of Videotape Recorders

A state contracts with an electronics laboratory to test thirteen videotape recorders to assist purchasers in school systems.

Sponsor: A state education authority

Duration: 1966

At an electronics testing laboratory equipped for just such tests, a team of four electronics specialists conducted a series of tests on thirteen models of videotape recorders obtained from seven producers. The tests are described in detail in a report, and pictures are included for each recorder at the same stages in the tests. Also included are mechanical comparisons and a chart of specifications as supplied by the producers. The facts are presented without editorial comment.

The report also includes information on lighting and on visual aids to improve instruction by television, on the availability of instructional television materials, including a directory of suppliers, and on the cost of kinescope recordings.

Index No. 094: An Evaluation to Assist Purchasers

A church-related agency looks at Super-8 projection equipment and films to assist churches and schools in their purchases.

Sponsor: A large Protestant denomination

Duration: 1967-1968

On the basis of criteria set by a church-appointed committee, the agency staff selected four Super-8 projectors for intensive evaluation and obtained samples from producers.

An independent laboratory made test film to the agency's specifications for each of the projectors; each one was run hundreds of times and then rated for wear. In one case where wear was excessive, the producer was notified and upon investigation made arrangements to redesign or rework the cartridge and head. The agency then arranged for purchase of corrected equipment from a dealer unaware of the nature of the sale and repeated its tests.

Other electrical and mechanical tests were applied and equipment was shipped by express to test sturdiness. On the basis of agency recommendations, a model which had been damaged in one shipment was altered by its producer and the new version stood up well to fifteen days of express shipment.

Projectors were also used in the field before evaluations were written, and the original evaluations were updated as additional information or revised models became available. Results are reported in a fashion which leaves little doubt of the reporter's preference.

The report also includes a description of Super-8 film and a comparison of magnetic and optical sound. It also contains price lists for having Super-8 film printed at two commercial film laboratories.

Index No. 004: A Survey of Equipment in Use

A state education authority surveys every school district in the state to obtain information on educational communication practices and needs.

Sponsor: A state education authority

Duration: 1965-1966

A detailed questionnaire was sent to each school district in the state, to be completed and returned "by the person responsible for educational communications (audiovisual, television and electronic classrooms, programmed instruction) for [the] school district." The first part of the questionnaire inquires about personnel complement, machine complement, budget, and ability to fulfill need for services; the rate at which use of services is increasing and the problems with supplying services come next. The third section deals with software availability in the district and the fourth solicits opinions of brands of equipment in use within the district and an estimate of the frequency of repairs. After requests for description and rating of any language laboratory in use in the district, and for information about the use of television there, the questionnaire inquires about the relationship between the educational communications program and the school library program in the district and requests a rating of the need for certain services which can be provided by the state education authority.

Summarization of the responses, for instance, on the mechanical aspects of the overhead projectors in use around the state gives a valuable catalog to assist in evaluation. For each projector in use are listed the school districts which use it, how many each district has, the rating (A to F; A = best, F = poorest) of the district director of Educational Communications as to its mechanical characteristics, and a rating (on the same scale, A to F) of its acceptability for use by teachers.

SPECIAL-PURPOSE SELECTION

Special Education Materials

In recent years, special education has received increased attention as increased possibilities for diversity in instruction have made the tailoring of educational procedures to special conditions something which could be considered. Selection of materials for other than typical students is not necessarily accomplished differently from any other selection, except that a special expertise is required of the persons making the judgments, and there is an emphasis on trial use and post-use evaluation.

It is of interest to note that each of the projects described herewith is funded by the U. S. Office of Education. There is no reason to believe that some other education authority, state or local, might not fund such investigations, but no examples came forth in the course of the survey.

Index No. 040: Selection for the Mentally Retarded

A state education authority undertakes a program to identify, evaluate, and establish criteria for the selection of instructional material for use with the educable mentally retarded.

Sponsor: U. S. Office of Education, under Title VI-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

Duration: 1968-1971

A steering committee of six--the project director from the state education office and a regional coordinator from each of the five (out of twenty in the state) educational service centers concerned in the project--meets four times a year for week-long periods with representatives of publishing companies, who are asked to correlate available materials to the curriculum for the mentally retarded. The steering committee determines which materials shall be subjected to intensive study. These materials are purchased and placed in classrooms--one in each of the five regions--for trial use. In-service training is given where needed. Evaluations are used in determining what available material can be used with mental retardates and how it should be sequenced, and to indicate areas where materials must be developed.

Areas for which materials are considered are ones to develop personal and social competences, physical competences, and vocational proficiencies, at each level of the curriculum (elementary and secondary) for the mentally retarded.

Index Nos. 057 and 058: Selection for Migrant Children

Two subsidiary projects supply evaluative information for a statewide project for education of migrant children.

Sponsor: U. S. Office of Education, under Titles I and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

Duration: 1967-1968

Project One: Prior to the opening of a demonstration school for migratory children, a five-member committee (first grade, fifth grade, and special-education teachers, an elementary supervisor, and a counselor) reviewed existing materials which might have relevance for migratory children, indicating probable usefulness and suggested grade level of ones to be subjected to further investigation. These materials were tried in the demonstration school and the results of the trial were incorporated with the committee's comments in listing materials as an aid to teachers of migratory children throughout the state.

Project Two: A regional education service center, in order to provide sixteen-millimeter films suitable for use with migratory students in kindergarten through grade nine, had thirty teachers of such children preview and evaluate films suggested for the purpose by their producers. Materials were purchased on the basis of these evaluations. A catalog of the films is supplied to schools, which may borrow the films from the service center. Users are supplied with a form to supply the center with evaluations based on usage. At the end of the school year the collection is revised on the basis of circulation figures and the evaluations returned with films.

Index No. 093: Selection for the Handicapped

A Special Education Instructional Materials Center selects and makes available for examination materials usable with handicapped students.

Sponsor: U. S. Office of Education, under Title VI-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

Duration: 1968-

On the basis of catalog listings, recommendations of teachers, or other descriptions, the center obtains materials for evaluation. Most of the materials are purchased through grants. Some, however, are given to the center by producers. The materials are used in classes for special students(hard of hearing, partially sighted, mentally retarded, perceptually handicapped, or emotionally disturbed). Teachers submit written reports, which are kept on file at the center. In some cases, on the basis of the teachers' reports materials are subjected to more intensive evaluation.

These materials are kept at the center for examination. Workshops of five or six teachers at a time may discuss the materials with representatives of producers, and materials are circulated for trial use by teachers. Workshop participants and trial teachers submit written reports, which are used to prepare recommendations to producers and advise on purchase for schools.

Index No. 140: A Special Education Instructional Materials Center Specializes in Cooperating with Producers

This center, one of the few located within a state education department, has access to a large number of classrooms.

Sponsor: U. S. Office of Education, under Title III of Public Law 89-105

Duration: 1967-

Materials for teaching mentally, physically, and emotionally impaired children are bought as they become available and distributed for trial use in as many classrooms as possible, through a network of three regional and thirty-one associate centers. Teachers report to the Center their reactions to the materials in use, and those materials receiving favorable reviews are described and recommended in SEIMC publications. Suggestions for improvements are discussed with the producers of the materials. In line with that effort to cooperate with producers, the Center has served producers as a developmental trial center and has reviewed and made recommendations on producers' collections.

Index No. 129: Selection for the Deaf

A national professional organization devises standards for library-media centers in schools for the deaf.

Sponsor: Office of Captioned Films for the Deaf,
U. S. Office of Education

Duration: 1966-1968

After a status study of libraries in schools for the deaf, committees of school library specialists and of teachers, librarians, and administrators in schools for the deaf, using the American Library Association's Standards for School Library Programs, developed a comprehensive set of guidelines to assist in the establishment and improvement of media centers in schools for the deaf. Major areas covered are program, including services to individuals and groups; personnel, including special qualifications and professional training required of the staff, as well as quantitative standards for staff; collections of printed and of audiovisual materials, again including quantitative standards; quarters and equipment; and annual expenditure required for proper maintenance of the collections.

Programed Instruction Materials

The selection of programed instructional materials is somewhat different from other materials selection since the material itself is different in nature from other teaching materials. The survey brought forth only one example of a plan for evaluating programed material; it is described on the next page.

For assistance in selecting programed materials there are several publications. Guidelines for use of producers and users of programed instruction materials have been set down by a joint committee of three professional organizations, the American Educational Research Association, the American Psychological Association, and the Department of Audiovisual Instruction of the National Education Association. The U. S. Office of Education has issued guides to programs available. They describe the programs in some detail, giving sample frames as well as information as to stated purposes, availability, and cost. A book on self-instructional programs published in 1966 gives detailed instructions for evaluating a program, with a check list to assist in doing so. The EPIE Institute has considered programed instruction materials for several grades and subjects.

Index No. 095: Selection of Programed Instruction Materials

A branch of the military examines programed instruction materials for use in its training programs.

Sponsor: A branch of the United States armed forces

Duration: Ongoing

The selection is carried out by an instructor, who first compares the objectives of the materials with the objectives of the course. He then examines the text for suitability to those objectives and the validation data for evidence of success.

A comparison is made of the characteristics of the validation population and the student population. Significant differences may not rule out the programed material under consideration but may make it necessary to make adaptations, such as a change in terminology in order to adapt a civilian program to military use, or provision for additional training for the student population before they attempt the program.

The program, as adapted if need be, is then tried on a representative sample of the student population. This branch of the service requires that ninety percent of the students achieve the objectives of programs used in its training procedures.

Then must be considered, before a final decision is made, the questions of increased effectiveness, savings in teacher and student time, cost factors, and availability of qualified instructors and equipment. Material is adopted only if its use will result in training improvement.

Standardized Tests

References to selection of standardized tests were almost entirely absent from this survey, occurring peripherally in connection with textbook programs which sometimes include tests and in a set of guidelines for overall evaluation of special-purpose education programs, which contains a succinct statement of points to be considered in evaluating a test.

Test publishers do sometimes make available guidelines and instructions for matching tests to instructional plans and to students. There have been, too, guides on selection of tests for specific purposes, notably, a detailed comparison published by the International Reading Association of five tests of reading readiness and five elementary reading achievement tests. The most comprehensive selection aid, however, is a massive and often up-dated compilation of reviews of all standardized tests by test makers and other evaluation specialists.

Special Curriculum Materials

Another aspect of materials evaluation mentioned in the course of the survey is selection of materials to fit into a specific program. Three examples are adduced here, two designed for the individualization of instruction and one to bring about change in the teaching of social studies.

Index No. 104: Selection for Individualized Instruction

An innovative junior high school selects materials for inclusion in learning concept packets.

Sponsor: A city school district

Duration: 1966-

Students progress through courses at their own speed as they complete "Unipacs"--single-concept packets of materials exploring the concept, the objectives of instruction in it, and the technique to be used in teaching it, and containing lists of learning materials needed and copies of evaluation instruments. Teaching teams, composed of teachers, teacher aides, paraprofessionals, and perhaps student teachers, select materials to be included in Unipacs on the basis of their knowledge of objectives to be fulfilled. The team meets again after the majority of students have completed a Unipac to revise it, if need be, on the basis of the performance of the students on tests of their mastering of its objectives.

Index No. 105: A Social Studies Project

A staff of social studies specialists helps schools to meet their social studies teaching goals.

Sponsor: U. S. Office of Education, under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

Duration: 1968-

This social studies project offers its entire package of services, including an in-service retraining program now in a developmental stage, to any public, private, or parochial school in the area it serves, to help them implement an innovative social studies program. The staff of the project sets forth a social studies curriculum recommendation (based on the latest research findings in social studies education) for kindergarten through twelfth grade. Cooperating schools can make a diagnosis of their social studies programs on the basis of these recommendations. As part of its research, the project asks students and teachers for paired comparisons of materials in innovative social studies programs (developed elsewhere) in the light of the project staff's recommendations. Materials evaluations are to reflect the recommendations; include descriptive, analytic, and evaluative elements; and show the effect of the teacher on the success of the course.

Index No. 106: Available Materials in Individualized Instruction

An experiment in computer-managed individualized education.

Sponsors: A private education corporation, a non-profit behavioral-science research institute and twelve school districts.

Duration: 1966-

Twelve school districts across the country are cooperating in an experiment to individualize education, using currently available instructional materials in conjunction with carefully specified educational objectives and criterion-referenced achievement monitoring. A computer is used to facilitate recording of progress and matching of materials to students. Participating teachers and subject-matter specialists construct teaching-learning units which guide the students through instructional activities chosen to maximize pupil attainment of sets of specified objectives; these units are revised on the basis of student performance on post-unit tests.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"A Survey of Textbook Purchasing Practices." School Management, March 1966, pp. 137-166.

American Educational Publishers Institute. State Textbook Practices, A Comprehensive Survey. New York: American Educational Publishers Institute, 1968.

Institute for Educational Development. The Selection of Educational Materials in United States Public Schools. New York: Institute for Educational Development, 1969.

Kahn, Gerald, and Warren A. Hughes. Statistics of Local Public School Systems, 1967. Washington: National Center for Educational Statistics, U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1969.

National School Boards Association. Who Makes the Buying Decisions in the Public Schools? Evanston: National School Boards Association, 1969

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Education Directory 1967-68, Part 1, State Governments. Washington: National Center for Educational Statistics, U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1967.

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Education Directory 1968-69, Part 2, Public School Systems. Washington: National Center for Educational Statistics, U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1968.

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The State of State Departments of Education, The Fourth Annual Report of the Advisory Council on State Departments of Education. Washington: U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1969.

APPENDIX A

THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Edward G. Bernard, Director
Bureau of Audio-Visual Instruction
Board of Education of the City of New York

James A. Boula
Director of Instructional Materials
Office of the Illinois Superintendent of Public Instruction

Lee E. Campion, Director
Division of Educational Communications
New York State Education Department

Nile D. Coon, Director
Bureau of Instructional Services
Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction

Robert Gerletti, Director
Division of Educational Media
Los Angeles County Schools

Claude Hass
Bureau of Audio-Visual and School Library Education
California Department of Education

Guy Helmke
Bureau of Audio-Visual and School Library Education
California Department of Education

William Lewis
(formerly) Managing Director
Delaware ETV Network

George Lipscomb, Director
Instructional Media
Texas Education Agency

Francis Pinkowski, Assistant Director
Division of Research, Planning, and Evaluation
New Jersey Department of Education

David J. Rees, Associate
Bureau of Classroom Communications
New York State Education Department

J. M. Shaver
State Supervisor, Audiovisual Education
North Carolina Department of Public Instruction

Mr. Harlan Ford, Assistant Commissioner for Teacher Education and Instructional Services, Texas Education Agency, and Mr. Harry Skelly, Chief, Bureau of Audio-Visual and School Library Education, California Department of Education, assisted the Advisory Committee in some of its deliberations.

APPENDIX B

A NOTE ON EVALUATION FORMS

The survey brought to the attention of the compilers so many questionnaires, check lists, and rating sheets used in the process of selecting instructional materials that it seemed worthwhile to comment on these examples in particular and on the use of such instruments in general.

On several important points in the use of the evaluation instruments received, evidence is lacking. If manuals or instruction programs for the completion of the forms exist, no examples accompanied the forms submitted in the survey. Similarly, no plans for monitoring the evaluations, or for synthesizing and summarizing responses, or for interpreting, using, or disseminating results, were received, though throughout the implication is that purchase decisions rest on the results obtained from such forms, and in some cases it was stated that the forms are filed so as to be available to anyone interested in the material evaluated.

The mere existence of the nearly fifty forms received in the survey reflects the continuing quest for objectivity in education. That does not mean that it would be possible to characterize all the forms as "objective," and it is likely that the most "objective" ones are the least satisfactory for obtaining a good base for making selections. The question arises as to whether objectivity in this connection should be prized above all else. The user's subjective judgments of its rationale and principles are of utmost importance in his approach to and use of a text, or a film, or a tape.

And subjective opinions are not made objective by use of a rating scale, though carefully worded questions in a rating scale can sometimes channel subjective judgments in a useful way. Nevertheless, even such forms, if they permit or request responders' comments, are apt to achieve more pertinent evaluations than rating scales alone.

This is not to say that the very useful characteristics of objective evaluations must be done away with in the selection process. Quantification of check list and rating-scale responses certainly is possible, and it would serve a useful purpose in screening, for instance, so that only those subjective comments which deal with potentially useful materials need be considered. However, such quantification should be based on research to determine the relative importance of items in the rating scale. One form received did indeed indicate differential weightings of responses, but information on how weights were assigned was not supplied. Another form used a numerical rating scale and assigned a simple total as a "score" for each book being considered. Such diverse elements as "quality of typography" and "adequate coverage of the subject matter" are given exactly equal weight in those "scores," which thus become dangerous as a basis for selection.

Very few of the forms received fall into such traps of misused scientism; most of them were designed to elicit information to be used qualitatively, and as such, undoubtedly, added a great deal to the selection process. Nevertheless, they did not avoid all pitfalls, and they did miss some opportunities.

In some cases, the forms indicate a search for a universal rating sheet, check list, or questionnaire for product evaluation. No such form is possible, and to search for it is to avoid the problem of developing useful, reliable, valid instruments for the job at hand. Specific forms, directed at the points considered important by the group responsible for selection, provide the most useful basis for decision making.

Implicit in the forms received is the notion that the person completing the form is thoroughly cognizant of all aspects of the curriculum in which materials will be used and of all characteristics of the students with which, and the teachers by whom, they will be used. Further than that, there is a tacit assumption that the curriculum is the same for all classes (which it may be), that the student groups are all homogeneous and exactly alike (very unlikely), and that the teachers are identical in skill and training (also very unlikely). In only the rarest case is there opportunity to indicate that a material is suitable for some students and not for others, and at that, the only distinction among students is their reading level: "above average," "average," "below average." Nothing about ethnic groups, student interests, or socioeconomic levels appears in any of the forms received. And there is no way to indicate that one book may be of particular help to an inexperienced or not very well-prepared teacher and that another can serve well only if the teacher brings certain skills and training to the job.

Only one of the forms received specifically called for answers from students, and none mentioned parents or administrators. Overwhelmingly, the teacher is the respondent. It seems logical that he be central to the evaluation, but his judgment might well be tempered by the opinions of others affected by the materials. The question of whether an instructional item will stimulate classroom discussion and search for further information is an item to be "rated" in many forms. In this situation it would seem that information from students would be particularly valuable. And when the question is raised with teachers, it would be well to give an opportunity to indicate reasons for a rating and perhaps to state the questions raised, if any, by the material. It may be that the material presents a case so badly that it will be a valuable vehicle for discussion. A rating from "superior" to "poor" cannot cope with such a contingency alone.

As stated here and earlier, forms which supplement ratings or check lists with comments produce more complete evaluation information than do either rating forms or totally unstructured requests for opinion alone. Requests for comment must, however, be as "single" in intent as possible. One questionnaire received asks the following question:

> When critical controversial issues of the present are included in the material, are these issues presented in such a way as to lead toward better citizenship on the part of students?

Any information elicited by that question consists of each responder's judgment as to what issues are critically controversial today, what "better citizenship" is, and what type of presentation leads to that better citizenship. More useful information might be obtained by listing, perhaps at considerable length and in some detail, what a responsible authority (all department heads, a committee of the Board, or some such group) considers "the critical controversial issues of the present" and asking each responder to indicate whether each one is covered, whether he considers the coverage in each case thorough, fair, and properly aimed at its intended audience, and the reasons for his opinions.

Some of the forms received were designed to help responders evaluate effectively by asking pertinent questions. Instead of merely asking for a check mark to indicate whether a teacher's manual is good, a form might ask questions about specific aspects of teacher's manuals: Are lessons planned with time sequences? Are suggested procedures easy to follow? Is there special emphasis on probable problem areas? Are supplementary drills, discussion questions, and outside activities suggested?

Considerable difference in a responder's perspective might be engendered by asking for ratings and opinions in the context of comparison as a means of getting an idea across: Is it important that the color version of the film be purchased: Will this tape hold the student's interest better than the teacher would? Is this new film so far superior to the one on hand as to warrant its purchase? Will a filmstrip teach this concept as well as a film will? Is this film too long to be practical as a means of teaching this concept?

Implied in the questions above are others concerning costs. Costs of purchase, maintenance, and support all have their effect on a responder's judgment about a product. In the realm of books, films, and other software, the fact that there may be maintenance and support costs is not as obvious as in the realm of equipment. Nevertheless, flimsy books may have to be rebound, someone must rewind used tapes and films, elements must be sorted and returned to place in kits and displays, consumable workbooks must be replaced. Questionnaires can get at the facts about these points and also elicit some information as to their importance to a decision about a material.

In equipment evaluations, central points should certainly be safety for students and teachers, availability of sufficient appropriate software, and the need for and availability of specially trained operating personnel. Very few forms used in evaluating equipment were received; they consisted primarily of tests of operating efficiency. Check lists could easily cover these central points as well as matters of maintenance and support costs, availability of service, durability, compatibility with support equipment already on hand, and so forth.

Other questions which may affect purchase plans and which can easily be asked--though perhaps not always expressed in easily agreed-upon terms--deal with such matters as attractiveness and convenience. Legibility of print material and ease of use of nonprint material can be investigated too. A considerable amount of valuable information can be obtained in a useful and relatively easily handled form by means of a check list or a questionnaire.

APPENDIX C

FORMS USED IN THE SURVEY

Initial Letters

Two very similar letters went to the representatives in the fifty states and the District of Columbia of the Association of Chief State School Audio-Visual Officers (ACSSAVO) and to the coordinators in the fifty states and the District of Columbia of projects under Title III of the National Defense Education Act. With the letters went descriptions of the sorts of projects about which information was sought, and a form post card for replying about telephone interview arrangements. The letter to ACSSAVO members is reproduced on page 102.

Telephone Interview Check List and Record

On the basis of the post card replies, initial information was entered on a form (page 103) which facilitated scheduling and recording the interviews as well as serving as a means of ensuring that all relevant questions were asked and information given.

Letter to Persons Recommended as Interested in Selection

A form letter (page 104) went to numbers of educators whose names were received in the telephone interviews or by correspondence. Adaptations of the letter were sent to certain individuals by the staff of the EPIE Institute, in cases where information on a specific project was sought, or when it was important to say specifically who had recommended that the letter be written.

Memorandum to Responders for Approval of Entries

A form memorandum (page 106) went to persons who had supplied, specifically for this survey, information on projects written up as examples. A letter covering the same points, but also describing the survey to some extent, went to persons similarly responsible whose reports had come to the EPIE Institute independently of the survey.

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
ALBANY, NEW YORK 12224

DIVISION OF EDUCATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS
LEE E. CAMPION, DIRECTOR
GR 4-5974

June 1969

Dear

The New York State Education Department, in cooperation with the education departments of California, Delaware, Illinois, New Jersey, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Texas, under an Office of Education Title V ESEA contract, is compiling information on programs to evaluate instructional materials, equipment, and systems. The information will be consolidated into a "reference work," to be used as an aid in strengthening the role of State departments in assisting in materials selection. We shall see that you receive a copy of the reference work, which I hope you will find helpful.

The task of preparing the reference work we have subcontracted to Educational Products Information Exchange (EPIE) Institute, specialists in instructional materials descriptions and evaluations. They would like to discuss the project with you, as someone knowledgeable about product evaluation activities in your state, so they propose to telephone you during the week of if that is convenient for you. They will ask you for copies of or references to reports -- formal or informal -- on evaluation programs you have been concerned with, and for names of persons who may be able to supply information on other materials evaluation projects. The enclosed article on "Project Aim," and the short excerpt from a report on a study of video tape recorders, show the types of programs we are interested in. These were done by State departments, but we know that similar approaches to materials evaluation have been undertaken by Title III centers, or under Title I or Title II auspices, or by local school systems, and we hope you can lead us to such programs in your state.

Again, a project researcher plans to call you during the week of If you will be away, or if that does not give you time to get ready for the interview, please inform EPIE of your wishes on the enclosed card. Or, if you think we should discuss the matter with someone else rather than you, will you please refer this letter and its enclosures to him and drop EPIE a note giving his name? Their address is 386 Park Avenue South, New York, New York 10016.

Thank you very much for whatever help you can give us.

Sincerely yours,

Lee E Campion

LEC/td
Encs.

Lee E. Campion
Director

PHONE CALL TO:

DATE:____________________

NO:____________________

We are interested in projects in which instructional materials, equipment, and systems were (or are being) evaluated as an aid in selection. We are starting at State level but are interested in any such project. NOT just audiovisual -- ANY material, equipment, system.

1. What ones have you been connected with?

2. Can you send reports -- articles, memos, whatever form? If you want, we will Xerox and return original. Or can you give us references?

3. Who else should we call --
    State?

    local?

    university?

    Title I ESEA?

    Title II ESEA?

    Title III ESEA?

    testing organization (eg, Buyer's Lab)?

    other?

4. You will be sent a copy of the reference work that comes out of this survey. It may generate requests for information from you.

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
ALBANY, NEW YORK 12224

DIVISION OF EDUCATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS
LEE E. CAMPION, DIRECTOR
GR 4-5974

Dear

The New York State Education Department, in cooperation with the education departments of California, Delaware, Illinois, New Jersey, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Texas, under an Office of Education Title V ESEA contract, is compiling information on programs to evaluate instructional materials, equipment, and systems. The information will be consolidated into a "reference work," to be used as an aid in strengthening the role of State departments in assisting in materials selection. We shall see that you receive a copy of the reference work, which I hope you will find helpful.

The task of preparing the reference work we have subcontraced to Educational Products Information Exchange (EPIE) Institute, specialists in instructional materials descriptions and evaluations. We have heard from an educator in your state that you may be able to supply EPIE with infromation about one or more programs designed to evaluate instructional materials or equipment -- textbooks, films, tapes, kits, slides, projectors, or other such material -- for purposes of assisting in the selection of such materials for classroom use. If that is the case, and some sort of documentation of any such project exists, it would be most helpful if you could supply copies of any such documentation -- a report on the project, perhaps, or procedures and forms used in it, or any such pertinent information. If copies are scarce, your are welcome to instruct EPIE to make copies of your material and return the originals to you.

If you can refer EPIE to others in your state who may have information about programs such as I have described, it would be very much appreciated.

May I request that you address materials or any correspondence to the EPIE Institute, 386 Park Avenue South, New York, New York 10016. It will expedite matters if you mark the mail for "Title V Materials Evaluation Survey."

Thank you very much for whatever help you can give us.

Sincerely yours,

Lee E Campion

Lee E. Campion
Director

LEC/td

EPIE THE EDUCATIONAL PRODUCTS INFORMATION EXCHANGE INSTITUTE
386 PARK AVENUE SOUTH, NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10016 • A Nonprofit Professionals' Cooperative

Memorandum for

Subject: Report, "Evaluation Practices Used in the Selection of Educational Materials and Equipment"

From: Betty Braxton Preston Date: October 20, 1969

The staff of the EPIE Institute has completed the first draft of the report on selection of educational materials which we undertook under a subcontract with eight states (California, Delaware, Illinois, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Texas), pursuant to their contract, under Title V ESEA, with the U. S. Office of Education. The draft takes the form primarily of descriptions of selection practices supplied to us during the course of our inquiry.

You were kind enough to supply a description of a selection practice and I enclose herewith the portion of the draft which is based on your description. Will you please review the draft and let me know, just as soon as you conveniently can, whether we have reproduced the information accurately? We are most anxious to be sure that our report reflects exactly the various selection practices we describe.

We shall look forward to a reply from you very soon. If we have not heard by November 14, we shall assume that the draft is satisfactory to you.

One more point: When the report is completed, a copy of it will be sent to you. We very much hope that it will interest you and your colleagues and perhaps be of service in your continued selection efforts.

Thank you very much!